

A N
EXAMINATION
O F
Dr. C O M B E R's
SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY
O F T H E
Primitive and General Use
O F
LITURGIES
I N T H E
Christian Church.

By S. B. *Gold Samuel*

Liturgia est quodcumq; pietatis officium, etiamsi à privato præstetur. If. Casaub. exercit. in Baron. xvi. p. 383.

Nemo autem versatus in Græcorum Patrum lectione, ignorat, Liturgiam persæpe illis dici quicquid sit ad Deum colendum. Id. p. 384.

L O N D O N,
Printed for Richard Janeway in *Queens Head Alley* in *Pa-
ter noster Row.* MDCXC.

Zeta
Mrh16
1690

AN
EXAMINATION
 OF
DR. COMBES
SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY
 OF THE
Primitive and General
LITURGIES
 IN THE

Howe
 1/1/17

Church of England

By the Rev. John ...
 of the ...
 in the ...

Printed for ...
 in the ...

Printed

To the Reader.

TO THE READER.

Reader,

THE following Papers were writ some months since, and if the Author had known they would have been published at this time, I do not doubt but they would have been accompanied with the like account of what Doctor Comber hath produced for Liturgies in the Fourth Century. The Author is not one who is wedded to a Party; He hath often said, he knows not any one Party of a particular De-

To the Reader.

nomination, but it hath some things which either do, or by reason of an alteration of circumstances, may deserve to be rectified. He thinks what is really good and commendable in every Party should be approved: And he wishes that what is not so, in every Party, might be universally understood, and laid aside, or amended. He is a Conformist, upon Principles he thinks he can justifie, but which are more comprehensive than those which some appear to be influenced by in their Conformity. He useth the Liturgy of the Church of England in his Officiating in the Publick Worship, as fully as the Law requires. And he is so far from condemning the Publick Worship of Pious and Judicious Protestants who do not tye up themselves to Prescribed Forms, that he joins with them in their Publick Worship, as he hath opportunity. He is troubled to see so great an aversion to a General Union of Protestants in this Land, and that old Animosities are awakened out of their late Slumber. He is of opinion that the
Church

To the Reader.

Church of England is much prejudiced by the Indiscretions of many who pretend an extraordinary Zeal for Her. The matters we differ about are very seldom rightly Stated. Arguments are not well adjusted to what is in debate, What is offered for proof, is too ordinarily put upon the Rack, and by overstraining it, it serves only for a Pompous Show, and is of no real use at all. Though Doctor Comber hath often expressed himself in such a manner, as would justifie some keen Reflections, yet this Author hath forbore them, because he would not willingly exasperate any man of Learning or Ingenuity. And therefore he hath mainly determined himself to a fair Representation of the Doctor's Authorities, which he hopes can yield no offence to any man of a sober and honest mind.

The Author of the following Papers doth think, that to do Liturgies right in a full Discourse (especially History) of that matter, some notice should be taken of the various use of the word Liturgy in the Christian Church, and of the
time

To the Reader.

time when it was first used with that strictness of signification, Mr. Clarkson hath assigned it, in his stating the point. For he saith, It was at first of a very general importance, and was not limited to Publick Offices. That when it came to be used in a more appropriate sense, it was applied particularly to every Publick Office. And that after it was in a special manner appropriated to Forms of Prayer, it had not for a long time, that strictness of signification it has in Mr. Clarkson's stating the matter. And he further conceives, that this is not the proper signification of a Liturgy as used and enjoined in the Church of England. Therefore he thinks, that instead of endeavouring to prove the Antiquity of Liturgies in that sense, we should rather endeavour to rectifie the mistake which hath unhappily arisen concerning a Liturgy, as enjoined and used in our Church.

Having given you this account of the Author, and his design in the following Papers, I leave you to peruse the Papers themselves, and to judge as you shall see fit, whether

To the Reader.

*ther the Doctor have produced substantial
Proof, that Liturgies, or Prescribed Forms
of Prayer, were only, and unvariably used
in the Christian Church during the Three
First Centuries.*

ERRATA

Page 1. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 2. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 3. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 4. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 5. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 6. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 7. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 8. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 9. line 1. for "the" read "a"
Page 10. line 1. for "the" read "a"

ERRATA

To the Reader.

that the Doctor have produced his
Proof, that Liturgies of Prescribed Forms
of Prayer were only, and not actually used
in the Christian Church during the three
first Centuries.

ERRATA.

P 2. l. ult. r. *prescribed*. p. 4. l. 29. for *truly*, r. *freely*. p. 6. l. 22. after
out, r. *of*. p. 16. marg. r. *vadu*. p. 18. l. 11. r. *Lucian*. p. 29. l. 9. for
truth, r. *proof*. p. 36. l. 6. dele *as*. p. 37. l. 29. after *subject*, r. *matter*. p. 38.
l. 11. after *any*, r. *other*. p. 40. l. 26. r. *ωραχθῆναι*.

ERRATA

A N
EXAMINATION
 O F
Dr. COMBERS Testimonies
 F O R
LITURGIES
 (During the three First Centuries) &c.

S I R,

ABOUT the middle of the last month, I received, by your order, '*Dr. Combers* Scholastical History of the Primitive and General use of Liturgies in the Christian Church, together with an Answer to Mr. *David Clarkson's* late Discourse concerning Liturgies. I now return you my thanks for it; and I would have done it sooner, but that some businesses called me from home immediately after I received it, even before I had time to peruse it. I now certify you that I have read it: And I do herewith send you what I take to be a true account of the meaning of those Testimonies the Doctor doth alledge in the three first Centuries, for Liturgies. I forbear many Reflections, which several passages in the Doctor's Book would give

abundant occasion for. My design is little more than just to present you with the Doctor's quotations in their plain and entire sense. Your opinion of the Doctor's performance, I persuade my self, is not such, as will prejudice you against evidence. I therefore leave you to judge, whether his Authorities be to his purpose, and whether his Inferences be so *rational*, as he pretends his History is *Scholastical*; and whether his Book may properly be said to contain an Answer to Mr *Clarkson's* Discourse of Liturgies.

You will make the easier and more just determination, if the matter be first a little stated: for then you will perceive what the Doctor should prove; And whether what he offers for proof, do reach the point he hath undertaken to discourse.

P. 2. Therefore you must be sure to remember, that Mr. *Clarkson* is far enough from asserting, that Forms of Prayer are intrinsically evil. 'He does not deny
'but there were some Forms of Prayer of old, *viz.*
'Arbitrary and particular, such as this or that person
'composed himself, or made choice of, composed by
P. 3. 'others, for his use in publick. He owns the Lords
'Prayer was used anciently, tho' far otherwise than of
P. 4. 'late. He grants that divers Churches had a certain
'order, wherein they agreed to administer the several
'parts of worship, and particularly the severals in the
'Sacraments, so as each had its known and fixed place.
'That this order was settled in some Churches by custom, and in some there was in time a Rule for it.
P. 5. 'He saith there was also some kind of uniformity in
Idem. 'their Sacramental Prayers, that is, a general agreement to pray for the same things, tho' not in the same
'words.

P. 2. He expressly relates what it is, which is the point in dispute. And declares 'That by prescribing Forms are

'are meant, such as are imposed upon the Administra-
'tor, so as those must be used, and no other, nor
'otherwise, without adding, detracting, or transpo-
'sing. This (saith Mr. *Clarkson*) is it which is deni-
'ed, That in the Ancient Church, for many ages after
'Christ, such Liturgies and Forms of Prayer were com-
'monly imposed on those who administered the Sacra-
'ments, as are before described.

P. 6.

Thus you see what was denied, as well as what was
granted by Mr *Clarkson*, and therefore what the Do-
ctor was to prove. If the Doctor's quotations be not
home to this point, they do not reach that for which
he doth pretend to produce them. And whether for
the first three *Centuries* his Authorities do amount to
a proof of what is in dispute; yea or so much as of
Forms of Prayer, you may conclude as you shall see
fit, when you have considered the following account
of them.

Before I enquire into the passages the Doctor doth
quote for the proof of Liturgies in the particular *Cen-
turies*, as they come in their order, I will take notice
of a few passages which occur in his *Discourse concern-
ing the Grounds for Liturgies in Holy Scripture*, which
takes up some Pages, before he makes his entrance on
the First *Century*.

'The Doctor saith the Holy Bible makes it appear,
'that the People of God, from the beginning, did ge-
'nerally use Forms of Prayer and Praises in their Pub-
'lick worship. Now supposing this to be true, to
make it reach the present purpose, he should prove
they did not, nor might not use any Prayers or Praises,
but those very Forms; 'Yea (saith the Doctor) God
'prescribes a Form of Prayer for the penitent *Jews*, and
'charges them to take words with them, and turn to
'the Lord and say, *Take away all Iniquity, &c.* Hof.

P. 2.

Idem.

14. 2, 3, 4. 'Tis true, God doth command them to use words in their Prayers, and directs them what sort of words to use; but let the Doctor answer when he thinks fit, whether God doth bind them to use no words but what are there mentioned? 'But further, 'Forms of Prayer and Praise were indited by the Spirit of God for the publick service of the Temple, and 'commanded by the Lord to be used there. Is the inference from hence plain and just; Therefore men may devise Prayers of their own, and oblige the Church to use these, and none but these.

The Doctor refers to Doctor *Hammond* and Doctor *Lightfoot*, for proof that the Jews had a fixed Liturgy; whether their proof be solid touching that matter, would be too great a diversion to inquire. But if occasion required, I should not be afraid to undertake to produce the Authorities those two Learned Doctors build their proof, upon, for some things, the Learned will not allow we must acquiesce in upon their testimony.

I will not insist on the difference betwixt the Jewish and Christian Church-State. For we may suppose, Forms might be of general use among the Jews, and yet there be no necessity of an express abrogation of that way, to warrant peoples addressing themselves publicly to God in another way than by stinted Forms. For Prayer being commanded, and there being two ways wherein this duty might be performed, viz. by stinted Forms, and by expressing themselves truly, according to general Occasions, and particular Emergencies. There appears not any necessity that the use of Forms, as to the Lawfulness thereof, must of necessity be abrogated, in order to it's being Lawful to use the other way. But if we would prosecute the Doctors way of Arguing on this occasion, aright, something
 elle

else will follow than what the Doctor doth conclude, even what the Doctor, I am perswaded, would not be very willing to stand to. 'For seeing the Jews did worship God acceptably, &c. by set Forms, and 'Christ and his Apostles did joyn in these Forms, and 'never reprove the Jews for using them. The most obvious inference will be, That Christians must now use those very Forms, and none but them, unless those Forms be abrogated, and a positive institution of other Forms be left upon Record, either in the Gospels, or Epistles. For by the Doctors discourse, the Disciples had Forms of Prayers, which must certainly be Jewish Forms, and Christ only taught them another Form, which they were to add to those they had before; yea, according to what the Doctor relates, the Lord Jesus, when he provided his Disciples a New Form to be added to the rest, was not only so far from discharging people, and setting his Disciples free from the stunted way of Liturgies, but from their obligation to the Jewish Forms, 'That he would confine himself 'in the very Prayer he made them (whereby they 'were to be known from all others, to be his Disciples) 'to the Jewish Liturgy; so that there should not be 'one sentence in his Prayer, but what he took out of 'the Jewish Prayers then in use.

Now those who devote themselves to such notions as these, may do well to consider, whether if it be so (as the Doctor reportes) that Christ took every sentence of his Prayer out of the Jewish Prayers, and taught it his Disciples, that they might add it to their other Forms (which were Jewish) the obligation to use this as a Form of Prayer, and to use those other Forms, to which they were to add it, be not of equal duration? But alas! whether will some mens pretences to reading hurry them? What work will be made of Christianity

stianity, if the forced conceptions of some men who would be thought to have read much must be entertained? Some do represent matters in such a manner, as if they had a mind to perswade people, that the Lord Jesus was anointed with the Spirit, only to supply the meanness of his education, not to inable him to form and compose a Prayer himself, but only to collect and cull sentences out of other peoples Prayers, and then put them together into one form. Not many years ago other matters were represented at such a rate, by another hand, as if the Spirit had been given to the Apostles to furnish them immediately (because they had not been bred to such matters) with Philosophical notions, and some critical niceties, and particularly was given to St. *John* to inable him to write his Epistle in a Platonick strain. How far this sort of dealing may serve a particular interest for a while, I will not inquire. But it hath no probable tendency to promote the main design of Christianity.

P. 6.

“The Doctor saith that Christ in giving his Disciples a new Form (when they desired him to teach them to pray) and Copying the several Petitions out of the Jewish Liturgy, instead of intimating that he intended to reform the old method of praying by Forms, did shew his approbation of praying to God in a prescribed Form. But he might with as much clearness have pusht his inference from those premises further, viz. That he did shew his approbation (at least) of his Followers composing Forms of Prayer (if they are to compose any for constant publick use) only out of the Jewish Liturgies. I may further mind you that the Doctor doth ordinarily discourse too loosely concerning Forms of Prayer, as not being mindful of what he hath undertaken to discourse of. For if he find any words used in Prayer, which were

were to be met with any where else before, those words he alledges for proof that the whole Prayer was a Form. Thus 'Christ used a Form of Prayer on the 'Cross (saith the Doctor) extracted out of the 22^d. 'Psalm, which begins, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* But pray who did extract the Petitions, and put them into a Form for him, and oblige him even on that occasion to use no other words, but what were ready provided to his hand.

P. 7.

In the next Paragraph the Doctor freely grants, 'that the Lords Prayer is not only a Form, but also a 'direction to draw other Forms by; so that we are not 'confined to the use of this Prayer, but have Liturgies 'which are drawn up by the Lords Prayer. But if we are not limited to the Lords Prayer, but may use *Liturgies which are no other words, but such as are agreeable to it, both as to the Form and Matter of them* (which is but an odd sort of expression to fall from a Learned Doctor) why may not Ministers, keeping to the direction of the Lords Prayer, use other words than those which are in the Liturgy, as well as those who are for Liturgies may use other words then those which are in the Lords Prayer? This Concession we have from the Doctor upon his taking notice that Mr. *Clarkson* had said, that the Lords Prayer was antiently used, but not out of any apprehension that Christ did, in *Mat. 6.* injoyn his Disciples to use it. Mr. *Clarkson* shews that some eminent persons, both antient and more late Writers, were of this opinion; whether his quoting so many for that particular, was to the purpose, I leave the indifferent Reader to determine. But because the Doctor saith, *Maldonat only tells us, we are not always bound to use those very words.* I would desire you to take notice, that *Maldonat's* words are, *Non his necessario verbis, &c.* Which I conceive do rather signi-

P. 9.

P. 3, 4.

P. 11.

signifie, we are not absolutely bound to use those very words at any time. But take the words if you please, according to the Doctors interpretation, if he think *Maldonat* in the right, provided such a construction may be borrowed for his words, that is, That we are not always bound to use our Lords very words; I would gladly know then, how we came to be bound to use always other people's words.

The Doctor next speaks of a Gift of Prayer, which he represents, as if we were to understand by it, 'an extraordinary assistance of the Spirit to teach men new words and phrases in ordinary cases, and for their daily prayers. Whereas by the gift of Prayer, no more is meant, than an Ability to represent the sentiments of a Soul duly affected with the general and particular subject matters of Prayer, in proper and suitable expressions, and such as are proper to beget, and excite, and improve such Resentments, and Affections in those who shall hear and join in the use of them, for that purpose. The gift of Prayer, soberly considered, does not imply any necessity (as the Doctor hints) constantly to vary, and use all new words. Indeed the exercise of this gift cannot very well consist with an obligation constantly to use the very same words. Nor is it usually pretended, that this is an extraordinary gift of the Spirit; but as by the blessing of the Spirit, the Heart or Soul comes to have a lively apprehension, and affectionate sense of what is to be subject matter of prayer; so the person, who is thus inwardly disposed, hath ordinarily a readiness to express himself in words, which bear some proportions to the disposition of his Soul and Spirit, and which are very proper to kindle and excite the like affections, dispositions, and inclinations in others who do seriously attend unto them.

them. Tho there are some particular words very pertinent to be used in prayer for general or particular mercies, yet there may be other words every jot as pertinent, which being used as occasion offers, may be more serviceable, and contribute more, to further the common or more appropriate end of Publick Prayer, than the constant use of the other words. The Lords Prayer doth comprehend the whole of Prayer. But yet those who are most for Liturgies, are for having other Forms framed, wherein the same things are asked in other words. Now those judicious persons who pray for the same things which are prayed for in prescribed Forms, without tying themselves up strictly to the words used in those Forms, do differ no more from the Forms which have not their words in them, than those Forms do from the Lords Prayer. And if the variation of Forms from the Lords Prayer may be truly beneficial and advantagious unto the people, why may not the like variations from Humane Forms be equally advantagious? I will propound one thing the more to explain this matter, which more nearly relates to the Doctor. He hath paraphrased the several Prayers in our *Common-Prayer Book*, so that the particular Prayers in that *Book*, are by his labour, and industry, and gift, made larger, and expressed in other words. The same things are requested, &c. in his larger Prayers, which are requested in the shorter Prayers in our *Common Book*. Now let him consider whether he had not such apprehensions, and affections in his mind and soul, relating to the particulars petitioned, and confessed, &c. in the Prayers contained in our *Common Book*, at that time, as he thought might be more commodiously and advantagiously expressed and represented, than they were by the words

used in the *Book*? Or whether such expressions did not occur to him, as he thought would, if duly attended to, help peoples devotions more, than the very words of the *Common Prayers* would by themselves? He certainly had some design in varying and altering the words; and I am willing to believe he had an honest design. Now if his using other expressions about the same matter, and altering Forms of Prayer, so as to make of short Prayers long ones, is of real use to promote devotion, why may not others variations be in their measure useful too? If it should be said, that his variations are not to be used publicly, I ask whether they be ever the better for that? Or whether his variations are the more useful, because only for private use? What hinders, but if those variations are proper to answer the ends for which they were devised, *viz.* the helping of people to perform the duty of Prayer with more understanding, and better affections, other variations in publick may be equally useful?

P. 16.

If, as the Doctor doth grant, 'every good man may 'by the ordinary assistance of the spirit be moved to 'pray with *Devotion* and *Fervency*: That is (as I conceive) may have his soul enlightned, and possessed with a true apprehension and knowledge of his spiritual concernments, and vigorously affected with them, and carried out towards God in fervent desires, inclinations, and affections suitably to his present occasions; What reason can be rendered why he may not by the ordinary assistance of the spirit be inabled to express his inward resentments in proper expressions? The gift of utterance being the gift of the spirit, as well as other gifts. Mens discourses are usually answerable to their apprehensions and affections. What we darkly apprehend, we express obscurely: and what we under-

derstand distinctly and clearly, we discourse of plainly.

The principal thing, indeed, in Prayer is the frame and actings of our Souls; the inward exercise of Faith, Repentance, Love, and other Graces. * But, saith the Doctor, any good man may act these in the use of a Form. And therefore may pray in, or by the Spirit in the use of a Form. But I say it must still be noted, that if a man be to pray with others, (and that which we are now discoursing, is concerning one that by way of Office is to perform this duty in the hearing of others) so as to have them joyn with him in this performance, he must use words, and if he restrain himself to the words devised and put together by others, and these words do not so well express and represent the sense he hath, and which others should have of what is the matter of Prayer, as others which do occur unto him, and which he could very pertinently make use of for that purpose; he cannot be truly said to pray in or by the Spirit, according to the full import of that phrase. * But, saith the Doctor, then no man in the Publick * Assemblies, doth pray in the Spirit, but the Minister, * for the Minister alone conceives the Prayer, and it is * a Form to the whole Congregation, who must pray * in his words. To which I answer, That the matter in dispute at present, is only concerning him that officiates. Besides, it is not a Form to the Congregation, taking a Form in the sense we are now discoursing of. But the Congregation may joyn in the Spiritual Performance of this Duty, acting graces suitably to the occasions which are administred, and improving for this purpose; the Abilities God hath bestowed upon others, in order to the furthering and promoting of their devotion. This is the work which pertains unto the Congregation at that time; they not being called to express vocally their inward resentments, (during

the Ministers officiating in this performance) in the fittest expressions they are able.

The Doctor seems to be of the opinion, that in the Apostles days, there was an extraordinary gift of Prayer which some did partake of, and that their Prayers were Divine Revelations. They being immediately furnished by the Spirit, both with the Matter and Words of their Prayers; and that these Prayers were written down, and after that gift failed, they were preserved and used by the Church, and were transmitted down to us by their Successors. So that by this sort of discoursing, our Liturgies are Divine Revelations. But the Doctor hath none of the Ancients but *St. Chrysostom* to vouch for an Extraordinary Gift of Prayer in the Primitive Times. This is certain, before the Liturgies now extant, or any part of them which is not expressly contained in the Books of the *Old* and *New Testament*, will be owned by good Christians and sound Protestants for Divine Revelations, very substantial particular proof must be made of their being such. To father Liturgies in such an arrogant presumptuous manner, on the Holy Spirit, is not the way to bring them into credit with judicious and serious people. It may effectually provoke God to pour forth in a little time so much contempt upon them, they shall never get into repute any more. This is further certain, that our latest Liturgies have some prayers in them, which by the very make of them, any ordinary person may perceive they were not composed by Divine Inspiration. And if the other could be proved to be of such an original, surely these will not deserve to be thought the more venerable, meerly because they have been added unto them. Having said thus much concerning some passages in the Doctors Introduction, before he enters upon

upon the First Century : I will now briefly consider the Testimonies he doth alledge for Liturgies

In the First Century.

And he labours first of all to prove what he hath undertaken, by asserting that 'the *Essenes* (who 'have been believed by divers learned men to be Christians) had Forms of Prayer, for *Josephus* saith they 'used Prayers which they received from their Forefathers, which must be Forms ; and *Philo* saith they 'did sing alternately ; and *Eusebius* calls these, the 'Hymns sung amongst us Christians. And that excellent Historian labours to prove these *Essenes* 'were Christians by this Argument amongst some 'others, Because they prayed and sung Hymns in set 'Forms, as the Christians use to do. Thus far the Doctor. And I do readily acknowledge that *Eusebius* doth endeavour from what he finds in *Philo*, to prove the *Essenes* to be Christians : And particularly from their way of singing Psalms, and Hymns. But he doth not say one word of their having set Forms of Prayers : That *they prayed in set Forms, as the Christians use to do*, is the Doctor's own saying, for *Eusebius* doth neither say the *Essenes* had Forms of Prayers, nor that the Christians did use any. And yet *Eusebius* doth say, That *Philo's* Book doth comprehend in it the Rules of the Church. *Τῆς ἐκκλησίας αἰεὶ ἔχει κανόνας.* *Valesius* thinks this doth import, that that Book did contain in it all the Rules or Canons which were observed by the Christian Church in *Eusebius's* time. Further, *Eusebius* doth gather out of that Book what he thought was proper to shew how exactly these *Essenes*, and the Christians did agree in their Ecclesiastical Affairs, as he himself assures us in the Chapter before referred

P. 28, &c.

Euseb. Hist. lib.
2. c. 17.

referred unto ; And yet saith not one word of praying by set Forms ; which rather intimates there were no set Forms of Prayer used by the Christians in his time, seeing he omits the mention of the Forms the *Essenes* used, if as *Josephus* reports the *Essenes* had Forms of Prayer.

In the next place the Doctor thinks he hath a proof of Liturgies in *Clemens Romanus*. But whosoever considers *Clemens*, will soon perceive that the passages the Doctor hath been pleased to quote, are nothing at all to the present purpose. For *Clemens* had been perswading the *Corinthians* to lead a godly life, and to abstain from all kinds of vices, and to behave themselves with such respect and kindness one towards another, as did become them : And particularly he presses them all to observe the Offices and Duties which did pertain to them according to their particular stations, capacities, conditions, places, gifts, endowments and acquirements, certifying them, that whatever state and condition any man was in, whether he were rich or poor, strong or weak, he had some special business to mind ; or whatever his endowments and acquirements were, whether he were wise, humble, chaste, &c. these were received from the Lord, and he must give God thanks for them. He saith that there is some business and work God hath obliged every man unto, answerable to the state and circumstances he is in ; and this appearing to be so, by the Holy Scriptures, we all ought to do the Offices God hath enjoined us, according as our circumstances are, in the order and manner he hath appointed them to be done. In short, he tells them that people have a dependance one upon another, and God hath provided every man, whatever his condition is, a business, office and work, (which *Clemens* names *ασχολια*) which he is to attend unto, doing

doing every part of his Work, or Liturgy, in the manner God hath prescribed, and in the season he hath appointed, and what ever good he doth enjoy, or excellent qualification he is endued with, he is wholly beholden to God for it, and must therefore be careful to give thanks unto him for it. This he confirms, and illustrates by shewing that among the Jews, the High-priest had his business, and the Priests had theirs, and the Levites theirs, and the People had their works, which they were all in their several stations to attend unto and perform; from whence he inforces his exhortation to the *Corinthians*, that they would all mind their own business, do the work which God had appointed them in their places, be content with their own station, give God thanks for what they had, keeping a good conscience, ordering themselves modestly, decently, not transgressing the bound God had fixed for every persons Work, Office, or Liturgy;

ὑμεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἰαγμᾷ εὐχαριστῆτε θεῷ, ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχον, μὴ παρεμβαίνειν τοῖς ὁρισμένοις τῆς λειτουργίας ἀντὶ καὶνῶν ἐν σιμνότητι.

Epist. ad Cor.
vinth. edit. Hel-
mest. pag. 53.

What the Doctor alledgeth from *Pliny*, refers only to singing of Psalms, or Hymns. Indeed he would fain draw in Prayers along with them, though his Author say never a word concerning their Prayers, much less that they prayed constantly in the use of Forms, which were imposed upon them. The Doctor says that '*Plinies Account* agrees exactly with that 'of the *Essenes*, and they having Forms of Prayer, we 'must conclude the Christians had also. I inquire not what necessity there is to conclude thus. Concerning the *Essenes*, and their agreement with the Christians, I have spoken already. Nor is *Plinies Account* exact, if we believe the Account *Ensebius* doth give of the *Essenes*.

The

πρότερον ἐπὶ
τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν
τῇ προσευ-
χῇ ὅμα συν-
ἵχεται, μία
δύναμις ἔστω
κοινὴ, ἵνα ἵνα,
μία ἐλπίς,
&c.

Ignat. ad
Magnes.
πάντες ὡς εἶς
εἰς τὸν ναὸν θεοῦ
συντρίχεται,
&c. Id.

The Doctor hath but one Author more to quote in this Century for Liturgies, and that is *Ignatius*. And because *Ignatius* hath these words, *μία δύναμις*: He concludes he hath a solid proof of a fixed Liturgy. But if you consult *Ignatius* his Epist. *ad Magnes*. You will find that the Doctor hath not given the plain sense of the place. He is perswading them of *Magnesia*, not to be offended with, or contemn their Bishop, because of his youth, but to reverence him, and adhere firmly to his Communion, and come all together ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ (translate it how you please) to Prayer, that so their Prayer and Supplication might be one. *Ignatius* doth not call their Prayer and Supplication one, because they used one Form of Prayer, but on the account of their joyning together in the performance of that Duty. His next quotation out of *Ignatius ad Smirn*. is no more to his purpose than the former. Such expressions there are in the Epistle as the Doctor doth mention; but I think, if you consider the Epistle you will readily perceive that they do import no more than his declaration, that their Bishops Communion was Orthodox and Sound, Divine Ordinances being celebrated in his Church as they ought to be; therefore he would have them adhere firmly to his Communion, who will not perform himself, or allow others to perform the Celebration of the Eucharist or Baptism, otherwise than the Scripture doth warrant, And all that he saith of this kind, is only to secure the people from partaking in any administrations which might be corrupted by those who were infected, according to the account he gave in the former part of the Epistle. But there is not a word of prescribed Forms that I can find in the whole Epistle. It seems a little strange to me, the Doctor should be so concerned to have *Ignatius* (according to *Socrates* his Relation) own-
ed

ed to be the first that brought the usage of singing by way of Antiphone into the Church of Antioch; And that he should pretend that Theodoret's silence, concerning this matter, might proceed from his taking it for granted, and supposing it was generally owned and known. For the report of this matter, as it is in Socrates is generally, by Learned men, passed over as Fabulous and Chimerical; and Theodoret is as positive, and expresses that Flavianus and Diodorus were the first that brought that way of Singing into that Church, as an Historian can well be. His words are these (speaking of Flavianus and Diodorus) ἔσσι πρώτοι διχῇ διαλέγουσιν τῆς τῶν Παλλόντων χορῆς, ἡ διαδοχῆς ἔδωκε τὴν ἀντιφωνίαν ἡ δὲ δαξάν μελωδίαν. And Valesius certifies that Theodorus Mopsuestenus who lived at the same time with Flavianus and Diodorus, doth testify the very same thing, declaring that they had it from the Syrians. Having given you this account of the Doctors Quotations out of the Writers in the first Century, I will consider what Evidence he hath for Liturgies

Theodor. Eccles. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 24.

Annot. in lib. 6. Hist. Eccles. Socrat. p. 78.

In the Second Century.

The first passage he alledgeth in this Century is out of Lucian (as he truly saith) a jeering Pagan. The Doctor is of opinion that the Religious Assembly he describes, was a Christian Church. I think he had a design to ridicule all Religious Worship, and the better to effect his design, he jumbles some things in the Christian Worship, and some things in the Pagan Worship together, adding also what did occur to him, which he thought would contribute to the rendering of a Religious Assembly thoroughly diverting, and grateful to a prophane Genius. The passage the Doctor quotes out of this Author is this; τὸ ἐν ἑκτῷ ἀπὸ πα-

Lucien Pôit. lib. 2.

τοῦ ἀρχαίου, ὃ τῷ πλειόνον ἀπὸ οἱ τοιαύτης. *That*
Prayer which began with the Father, and ended with the
Hymn of many Names. Now *Lucian* doth not say, that
 he heard this Prayer in that Assembly which hath
 been described in that Dialogue. But acquaints him, he
 had brought in relating what passed there, that he had
 not patience to hear any more of that sort of stuff,
 and that a further discourse about such matters, would
 have the same effect on him, as a story would, con-
 cerning a Prayer beginning and ending as is before men-
 tioned. Which though *Julian* might design as a re-
 flection on the Christians way of Praying, yet for
 ought I know, it imports no more, than if you should
 tell me a Story of peoples beginning their Prayer, as if
 they worshipped but one person, and yet should conclude
 their Prayer in such a manner, as if they had been Pray-
 ing all the while to a great many persons. The Do-
 ctor thinks that *Lucian* doth by this Prayer mean the
 whole Communion Office. But this is only conjecture.
 I will say no more of that, but only mind you, that
 when the Doctor suspected his evidence for Liturgies
 in this Century would not be very clear, he assigned
 this for his Reason; 'We have no Authors, who had
 'occasion to Write particularly of the Church Service,
 'which they cared not to publish, lest the Pagans un-
 'der whom they lived, should deride or blaspheme their
 'Sacred Mysteries. And yet in the next Page, to serve
 a turn we must have the most jeering Pagan that Age
 did afford admitted to take a view of their Admini-
 stration during their whole Communion Office. But
 suppose *Lucian* was really at a Christian Assembly,
 and did hear there a Prayer which began with the Fa-
 ther, and ended with an acknowledgement of, and an
 ascription of Glory and Honour, in variety of expressi-
 ons, to every Person in the Trinity (as is very usual with
 those

those who do not bind themselves in all their Prayers, to a precise number of words) might not he give that description of that Prayer, which is before related, and yet there be no prescribed Liturgy imposed on that Assembly?

The next Author, the Doctor hath recourse unto, is *Justin Martyr*. Whether *Justin Martyr*, undertaking to write an Apology for the Christians, and in particular for their Church Service, had not occasion to write particularly of their Church Service, I leave the indifferent and unprejudiced Reader to judge. The Doctor doth acknowledge that 'he doth often speak of the Christian Assemblies, and of the several Duties there performed, &c. Now if they were tied up to the constant use of a precise number of Words in their Prayers, tho he might not think it convenient to report their words, yet what can be imagined to obstruct his declaring they did celebrate their Offices in stinted Forms? But, saith the Doctor, when *Justin Martyr* mentions Baptism, he only saith, They are taught 'to Fast and Pray, and ask of God the forgiveness of 'their former Sins, and being brought where water is, 'they are Regenerated in the same manner as we were 'Regenerated; from whence the Doctor infers, that 'even in his time they began to conceal the particular 'manner of Celebrating these Mysteries. Now I conceive the Doctor is under some mistake, as to this Passage: for *Justin Martyr* doth immediately relate in what manner they were Regenerated. *They are Regenerated in the same manner as we were Regenerated; for* (saith *Justin Martyr*) *they are then washed in Water, in the Name of the Father of all things, and Lord God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit.* And then he proceeds to some extent, in explaining and shewing the reason of all this; so that here appears not any intent that he had, to conceal any thing that

P. 31.

*Ibid.*Just. Mar.
Apol. 2.

was in use amongst them. But notwithstanding *Justin Martyr's* reservedness, in the Doctor's opinion, the Doctor meets 'with some general expressions which 'incline him to believe they had Forms in his time. 'He will not insist upon his saying they prayed for the 'Conversion of the Jews, and the Deliverance of the 'Gentiles from their errors, and for all men, though 'these are pieces of Antient Litany. I only ask whether these things cannot be prayed for, unless people be bound up to the constant use of particular prescribed words? And whether there be any evidence that *Justin Martyr* borrowed this account from any Litany?

P. 32.

Just. Mar.
Apol. 2.

'The Doctor next observes that when *Justin Martyr* speaks of the bringing the newly Baptized person 'to the place where the Faithful Worshipp'd God, 'he saith they there made Common Prayers for themselves, for the person Baptized, and for all other men every where with great fervency. Now (saith the Doctor) *Common Prayers do signify Forms that are known to all, and in which a'l may joyn*. But I answer, the question is not, what Common Prayers do signifie now; but whether *Justin Martyr* by *κοινὰς εὐχὰς* did mean set prescribed Forms, which they must constantly use, and from which they must not on any account vary? Here doth not appear any thing to incline us to think he meant prescribed Forms. But his very next words intimate the Reason why he called them Common Prayers [They made Common Prayers for themselves, for the person Baptized, and for all other men every where] viz. because they did all hold Communion in offering up Prayers to God, and their Prayers were not limited to themselves, but did extend to the whole Community of Mankind. What the Doctor doth here alledge out of *Ignatius*, hath been considered already; what he produceth out of *St. Cyprian* shall be considered when

when I come to his quotations out of that Author, where you will meet again with this same passage.

In the next place the Doctor reports a passage which Mr. Clarkson cites out of *Justin Martyr*, about which they do both make some stir. The passage is this; ὁ πρεσβυτερος ἐνχαὶς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐνχαριστίας ὁν δύναιμι ἀντιδρᾶν. *The President in like manner offers up Prayers and Thanksgivings, as well as he is able.* Mr. Clarkson urges this as a proof, that he who did officiate in the Publick Worship, was not tied up to the use of Prescribed Forms, but did pray and give thanks according to his ability. And he produceth many testimonies to prove that ὁν δύναιμι here used doth import so much. The Doctor undertakes to prove that that phrase doth signifie otherwise in this place. 'For (saith the Doctor) ὁν δύναιμι answers to ἐνέργειαν in the place before cited, and that declares the Prayers at Baptism (He should have said after Baptism) were made fervently, or with all their might. He endeavours to confirm this interpretation by producing some other passages, where the phrase seems to be of this importance. And then determines, that 'When we desire the several things prayed for in a Form, with all the earnestness and vigor we can, we may properly be said to pray ὁν δύναιμι, as well as we are able, or to the utmost of our power. So that the power here spoken of, refers to the affections, and not to the phrases and expressions of him that prays.

To all this I have these things to say; 1. *Justin Martyr* doth not refer us to the passage the Doctor hath recourse to, for the explaining of this phrase by ἐνέργειαν, but doth expressly refer us to what he had related a little before, where he saith the President offereth up Prayers and Praises to God, &c. and gives thanks

thanks for the benefits and gifts he vouchsafeth in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, *ὅτι πολὺ* [*ὡχαισας* *αὐτῷ τῶν καλῶν ὅσας τέτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ὅτι πολὺ ποιῆται*] which, for any thing, I do yet understand to the contrary, may signifie *largely, distinctly, and with variety of expressions.* So that if we must interpret *ὅτι δύναιτο* by what goeth before in *Justin Martyr*, we must explain it by this: For this is what *Justin Martyr* doth expressly refer us unto in this place. 2. Tho this phrase doth signifie fervently, and so refers to the affections, I do not understand any reason that can pertinently be alledged, why this should exclude him who officiates, from using his utmost ability to express his inward devotion, in the best manner and fittest words he can, to help the devotion of those persons who join with him in the Service. Put the Case, a Minister doth in Publick use a Prescribed Form of Prayer, and desires the several things prayed for in that Form, with all the earnestness and vigour he can; but yet perceives the words of that Form do not represent and express his inward resentments and devout affections in so vivid and proper a manner, for the helping and assisting of his hearers devotion, as he is able to represent them by his own expressions; I dare refer it to the Doctor, whether he may properly be said to pray in the use of that Form, as well as he is able, and to the utmost of his power. I will allow he doth pray fervently and devoutly; but I think it will be hard to perswade any man of sense, that he doth pray as well as he is able; unless we must be forced to grant, that a man may properly be said to pray as well as he is able, tho at the same time he is able to pray better than he doth. 3. As for all the quotations the Doctor alledgeth to prove that *ὅτι δύναιτο* doth note fervency and vigorous affections: I leave the Doctor to look them over again, and consider

consider whether his Authors do mean no more than vigorous affections, and had any design to exclude peoples using their best abilities, for the most advantageous outward performance of their Work and Duty.

The Doctor further observes, with reference to this passage, 'That this phrase doth only relate to the Hymns used in the Eucharist, and these Hymns were known Forms. To which I answer? 1. I think it equally relates to the Prayers and Thanksgivings which were celebrated on that occasion; and I leave any indifferent person, who understands the passage, to conclude (when he looks upon it as it lies in the Author) as he shall see reason, whether it doth relate more to the one, than to the other. 2. Tho Hymns may be, and often are used for celebrating the praises of God, yet that is not the only way whereby we may offer up our Praises and Thanksgivings to God. 3. *Justin Martyr* speaks here expressly of the Presidents offering up particular thanks for the benefits exhibited and vouchsafed in the *Eucharist*; and speaks of his performing the Offices of Prayer and Praise himself, without any audible concurrence of the people during the whole Service. Yea, he further acquaints us, that when the President hath finished these Offices, then it is the people do speak, testifying their joyful approbation by saying *Amen*. This is the account he gives us himself of this matter but a very little before the passage now insisted on, and whither he refers us in this very place, for the more distinct apprehending of his meaning here.

P. 35.

'But, saith the Doctor, all Christians are said to worship God and his Son, according to their ability, with Prayer and Praise; and private Christians we may be sure were not allowed to make their own Prayers
'and

P. 36.

‘and Praises in Publick Worship *extempore*.’ To this I answer, That the matter in dispute at present, is concerning him that Officiates. And all the stir which is made about this phrase, in the present case, amounts (I think) to no more than this, whether a Minister may properly be said to pray to the utmost of his ability, when he doth not pray to the utmost of his ability : Which in my apprehension is a very plain case, if people were free from prejudice. Well, but it may be enquired how the people can be said in the Publick Worship to pray according to the utmost of their abilities? I answer their circumstances are not the same with his, who is to officiate ; And therefore this phrase hath not the same importance when applied to the one, and when extended to the other. The people are said to pray to God, and to praise him according to the utmost of their ability in the Publick Worship, when they do make the best improvement they can, of the use he who doth officiate, doth make of the abilities he is indued with for the celebrating of these Offices, to the furthering of their own devotion.

P. 38.

There is one thing more the Doctor doth take notice of, with reference to the phrase we have been discoursing of. And that is this ; He saith, ‘ We are only to consider this phrase here, as it is applied to praying and praising God. And there it never signifies ‘doing these things *extempore* (he should have said according to the best of those abilities with which God hath endued them, who are to celebrate these Offices) ‘ but doing them very devoutly. Now whether inward devotion in these Services be all this phrase doth import, with reference to them who are to Officiate, I refer to what I have already said about that matter. I will further only mind you, that tho
the

the Doctor hath taken notice of some of the quotations Mr. *Clarkson* hath produced for the signification of this phrase in other cases, yet he hath not said one word here by way of reply to those instances Mr. *Clarkson* hath given, expressly relating to the cases wherein he doth acknowledge the phrase is at present to be considered. The instances Mr. *Clarkson* hath produced, relating to Prayer and Praise, you may find in the 118, 119, 120 pages of his Discourse concerning Liturgies.

The Doctor having done with *Justin Martyr*, proceeds to *Ireneus*, out of whom he alledgeth only one passage, which is, that '*Ireneus* relates that the Hereticks, to prove their phancies, did alledge that we (that is, the Orthodox) in our Thanksgivings, do say world without end. From hence the Doctor concludes, that 'these words being the very conclusion of the *Gloria Patri*, the Christians praised God in publick by this very Form which we now use; Glory be to the Father, &c. Now, allowing the Christians did usually in his time use this Doxology, how will this prove they were stinted in their Publick Worship to a prescribed Liturgy? But according to my apprehension, this is no proof, that this Doxology was then in use; unless it can be made appear, that *ὡς τὸς αἰῶνας ἢ αἰῶνον*, cannot conclude any Praise and Thanksgiving but this Doxology. The business in short is thus; *Ireneus* is shewing how absurdly those Hereticks did endeavour to prove their conceit of their *Æones*, which was by urging every sentence where they found the word *αἰών*, or *αἰῶνας*, as a proof of what they asserted. Amongst other things they pleaded that the Orthodox did usually conclude their Praises with saying, for ever and ever, or as the Doctor will have it, world without end. *Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς* *Iren. adv. Her.*

P. 39.

lib. 1. c. 1.

ἐν τῇ εὐχαριστίας λέγουσαι, εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Now all that can fairly be inferred from hence, I think, is this, that the Christians did usually conclude their Praises with these words, for ever and ever. And if no Prayers or Praises but prescribed Forms can conclude with these words, I am contented that this should pass for a proof of stinted Forms in *Ireneus* his time. But if Prayers and Praises, which are not Prescribed Forms, may conclude, and ordinarily are concluded with these words, I leave the Doctor to consider whether his alledging this for a proof of a fixed Liturgy, be not a way of arguing very like that which was used by those *Ireneus* did write against? *Tertullian* shall be considered when he comes in order, and then you may judge of the Doctors Inference.

P. 40.

*Clem. Alex.
Strom. 7.*

The next Author the Doctor makes use of, is *Clemens* of *Alexandria*: Out of whom a passage is quoted, concerning which he and Mr. *Clarkson* do differ, touching the meaning of it. The passage is this; *The Church is not only the name of the place for Publick Worship, but the Congregation prostrating themselves in Prayers, having all, as it were, one common voice, and one mind.* The dispute is concerning the meaning of *μία ὡς ἓν*; *ἔχον ἑνὸς τοῦ νοῦ*. Mr. *Clarkson* thought the Congregation had one voice in respect of the Ministers speaking in their stead, one for all. The Doctor thinks it signifies the performing the Offices of Prayer and Praise in a responsory way, which must be in known Forms, because the people not only joined in heart with the Minister, but vocally answered in their turns, they and the Priest often making up the sentence between them; and therefore they are said to have, as it were, one common voice. I leave the Learned to determine which of them is in the right, as to the sense of this phrase: And will only acquaint you, that I think

I think, if the way of Responsory Prayers, and Praises, had been antecedently proved to be the ordinary way of the Christian Church in the Primitive Ages, there would have been something to countenance the Doctors interpretation. But to interpret this place thus, can be no proof for Liturgies, because the interpretation is built upon a supposition, and takes that for granted, which it is alledged to prove. Besides, if the people did vocally answer in their turns, and they and the Priest did often make up the sentence between them, as the Doctor affirms; I think in thus doing, they could hardly be said to have, as it were, one common voice, for they would evidently have two common voices. The Priest having one common voice for himself and them, in his part of the sentence, and the People another common voice, for themselves and the Priest, in their part of the sentence. It does indeed exceed my reach to comprehend a Reason why the Congregation may not be said to have one common voice in Prayer and Praise, when they have appointed or chosen a Priest to officiate in their name, and do concur and join with him in those Offices. No nor why they may not be said to have, as it were, one common voice, in the Doctors notion of that phrase, when they do testifie their approbation of what he hath said (as *Justin Martyr* assures us they did) by saying *Amen*. But, saith the Doctor ' If the Minister had said all the Prayers, he, (i. e. *Clemens*) must have said plainly, they had one common mouth, or voice, but his words are, having, as it were, one common voice. I leave you to consider, whether their answering *Amen* is not enough to remove this scruple. Only you may take notice that the Doctor is of opinion that *Clemens* doth allude here to those words of *St. Paul*, *Rom.* 15. 6. And *St. Paul* speaks

there of glorifying God with one mouth, not, *as it were* with one mouth. The Doctor further observes from *Clemens*, 'that the Christians allotted several 'hours for Prayer, in imitation of *Daniel* and the *Jews*, 'and hence concludes it likely, that because the *Jews* 'had Forms of Prayer, they did imitate them in these 'too. I think it needless to make any Reply to this, because it is a forced way of reasoning, and is at best, all over meer conjecture. But, saith the Doctor, 'would 'those who prayed so often, vary the phrase every 'time? Now this is not at all to the point, for that which the Doctor should prove, is, that they were obliged constantly to use the very same words. The Doctor further tells us, 'That *Clemens* doth not relate what 'were the words of their Forms. There the Doctor speaks very right, but withall I must add, he never relates that they had any Forms. But *Clemens* tells us what were their main Petitions. And the Doctor saith, 'These matters they asked, were such, it was most fit 'to ask them in a set Form of words. That is one Doctors opinion. But if the Christians of that Age were of another opinion, what becomes of the Doctors argument? And he must give some evidence they were of his opinion, before what he asserts will pass for proof in the present case. But, saith the Doctor, 'If they had prayed for these things *extempore*, *Clemens* could not be so positive in the method as he 'seems to be. To which I make this reply, *viz.* *Clemens* reports the methods of Christians private devotions every jot as particularly, as that quotation he insists on, with relation to Publick Prayers, doth relate their method: Whether that I speak of be the very same the Doctor refers unto, I will not affirm, but it seems to have some affinity, and I am sure it is in the same Book his Margin refers to. If it should be the

the same the Doctor means, you will easily perceive how little it is to his purpose. And why should the Doctor think it strange, *Clemens* could be so positive (as naming three general heads of Prayer doth amount to) in the method of their Publick Prayers: tho they did not use a fixed prescribed Liturgy? Seeing he is every jot as positive in the method of their Private Prayers, unless they all used the same Forms in private too? The truth of which I am perswaded the Doctor hath no inclination to undertake. Now *Clemens* tells *Strom. lib. 6. p. 665.* us that the true Christian, [or as he terms him, *ὁ γινώσκων*] doth pray every hour. And that he doth first ask remission of sin; then that he may not sin again; then, that he may do well, and understand both Creation and Providence; and that his Heart being made clean by the Knowledge which he hath by the Son of God, he may attain to see God face to face. Such a passage as this relating to Publick Prayers out of one of the Ancients, would be look'd on by some men, as a swinging proof of a prescribed Liturgy. I leave you to divert your self with the Doctor's dextrous device, to furnish people with an Expedient to enable them to Pray by Book, with their Eyes and Hands lift up to Heaven.

The Doctor hath one Author more, whom he quotes in this *Century*, and that is *Tertullian* 'In whose works (he saith) we have sufficient evidence that they used Forms of Prayer and Praise. The passages he is concerned with out of this Author, are of two sorts. 1. Such as he alledgeth to prove the use of a Liturgy at that time. 2. Such as Mr. *Clarkson* produceth to prove the contrary, which the Doctor endeavoureth to make appear, do not answer the end for which that Author brings them. I will first consider the passages the Doctor alledgeth

as sufficient evidence that the Christians used Publick Forms of Prayer and Praise in his time. His first proof is this; That *Tertullian* declares, That Christ hath fixed a new Form of Prayer for us, who are his Disciples, viz. The Lords Prayer, which he expounds in a peculiar Tract, and in divers places calls it *The Lawful and the Ordinary Prayer*. I do acknowledge *Tertullian* near the beginning of his Book, *De Oratione*, hath this passage; — *Iesus Christus Dominus Noster, nobis Discipulis Novi Testamenti, Novam Orationis Formam determinavit*. The Great Question is, What *Tertullian* did mean by *Novam Orationis Formam*? The Doctor saith it was the Lords Prayer, which he expounds in a peculiar Tract. I think his meaning was otherwise; And that he did intend no more by that Phrase, than a new Instruction or Direction how to perform the Duty of Prayer, which he saith was necessary to the Gospel State or Administration: *Oportebat enim in hac quoque specie Novum Vinum novis utribus recondi*. And though *Tertullian* doth expound the Lords Prayer in that Tract, yet he doth consider it in his explaining of it, not as the whole he understands by his *Nova Forma*, but as an instance and example of one of the General Instructions our Saviour had laid down for the guiding of us in the performance of this Duty. He doth in a little time, even before he begins his explanation of the Lords Prayer, alter his phrase, and calls it *Orandi Disciplina*. And then tells us this New Way or Instruction for Prayer, did consist of several parts. The third he mentions is *Brevity*: Which he explains by our not laying any stress on the use of a confused heap of words, but our using such words as are proper and very comprehensive. And then he certifies us, that our Lord hath given us an admirable

Tertul. de Orat.
p. 788.

mirable example of this Brevity, which is the third part of his *Nova Orationis Forma*, or the Third Precept Christ enjoined to be observed in the performance of this Duty. *Et tamen Brevitas ista, quod ad tertium Sophiæ Gradum faciat, magnæ ac beatæ interpretationis substantia fulta est.* And his principal business in his expounding the Lord's Prayer, (which he immediately subjoins) is to shew how comprehensive our Saviour was in this Prayer, tho it was so short, or consisted of so few words. But notwithstanding *Tertullian* doth expound every part of the Lords Prayer, yet he doth not strictly tie himself to the method observed in the Lord's Prayer. As for *Tertullians Legitima & Ordinaria Oratio*, it *Id. p. 791.* seems to be just the same with his *Ordinata Religio Orationis*. Which I conceive is another phrase of the same import with his *Nova Orationis Forma*, and his *Orandi Disciplina*. Which (I think) do only signify the General Instructions Christ gave for the directing of his Disciples, or the directing of Christians, in their performing of this Duty of Prayer.

The Doctors next quotation out of *Tertullian* is of no use to the present purpose, till it be proved that people cannot join in prayer with him who officiates, unless they do use their voices, during that performance, as audibly, as he doth his, or at least till the pretended implication of their joining voices be better cleared, than by bare assertion. But, saith the Doctor, '*Tertullian* describes some of the things, which they desired of God to bestow on the Emperors, viz. that they might have a long Life, a quiet Empire, &c. To which I answer, that this may pass for a proof of a fixed Litany, when it shall be made evident, that the particulars mentioned by *Tertullian* cannot be prayed for, but in prescribed words, or that

P 44.

an account cannot be given of the things which are constantly prayed for, unless those matters be constantly prayed for in the same precise words. But you may take notice that *Tertullian*, when he relates what the Christians prayed for, doth not always use the same words, nor make the same enumeration of particulars. For a proof of this I refer you to *Tertullian* himself, in the places of his *Apology*. The Doctor refers to, p. 44. But if you consult *Tertullian*, according to the worser Edition, which is that I am necessitated to use, you must look p. 876, and 867. As for the Doctors quotation out of *Tertullian*, *De Anima*. I need not say any thing concerning it, because Mr. *Clarkson* hath expressly answered the Plea made from that place, and the Doctor hath not thought fit to say one word to his vindication of that place. The Doctor's next quotation is out of *Tertullian De Baptismo*. Concerning which I shall only tell you, that *Tertullian* is replying to those who pretended that Baptism is not necessary, because Faith is sufficient. Now amongst other things *Tertullian* doth urge the necessity of Baptism from Christs instituting of it. *Lex enim tingendi imposita est, & forma præscripta*, saith he. And this he proves by producing what is said touching this matter in the last Chapters of St. *Matthew* and St. *Mark*. What he saith amounts to this; Baptism is necessary, now under the Gospel, because the Lord Jesus hath commanded it, and told us in what manner it is to be administred. You may try your own faculty, and see whether from these premises, Christ hath instituted Baptism, and hath shewn in what manner it must be celebrated, you can draw such a conclusion as this, Therefore Prayer and Praises are to be performed in the Church by prescribed Forms, or that *Tertullian* did think so, or that

that in his days, the Church did worship God in the use of such prescribed Liturgies, as is the Subject of our present discourse. What the Dr. refers us to in *Tertul. ad ux-*
or. it only concerns singing, which is not to our present purpose. Besides, if I mistake not, it only relates to singing in the Family. The words in *Tertullian* are these; *So-*
nant inter duos Psalmi & Hymni, & mutuo protocant quis me-
lius Deo suo canet. *Tertullian* is representing some of the advantages which accrue from Christians Marrying with Christians, and this is one of them. But saith the Doctor, 'One of these Forms was the *Gloria Patri*, which he describes as *Ireneus* did by the last words, *World without end.* Now you must take notice that *Tertullian* in this last quotation is quite upon another Subject. And the quotation is out of another Book, his Discourse *de Spectaculis.* I will not stay to consider *Tertullians* sense exactly in this place. He is dissuading the Christians from frequenting the Heathenish Games, Exercises, and Shows, and represents to them how unbecoming them it must needs be, yea how sinful to concur with them in what did ordinarily pass on those occasions. *Avertit Deus à suis tantam voluptatis exitiosæ cupiditatem. Quale est enim, de Ecclesia Dei in diaboli ecclesiam tendere? de cælo (quod aiunt) in cænum? illas manus quas ad Dominam extuleris, postmodum laudando histrionem fatigare, ex ore quo Amen in sanctum protuleris, gladiatori testimonium reddere, in æiōas alii omnino dicere nisi Deo Christo?* Now how come these words of *Tertullian* to be a proof of Liturgies in the Christian Church? Why the Doctor tells us we here find *æiōas*; therefore there must needs be a Form; and this Form must be the *Gloria Patri*, because *æiōas* is in the end of that Doxology. the Doctor had told us before that *Ireneus* had reference to the

P. 534.

P. 35.

Tertul. de
Spect. p. 700.

Gloria Patri, because he found in him *ὁς τοι αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων*; and here *Tertullian* must needs refer to the same, because in him we have nothing but *ὁς αἰῶνας*. Can *ὁς αἰῶνας* be never used but in the *Gloria Patri*? I think *Tertullian* is not minding them that this was an expression the Christians did constantly use in their publick Worship, though it might be constantly used in their publick Worship, and their Worship not be performed in prescribed Forms; but he rather intimates that this was an expression which was ordinarily used at those sights and exercises he is dissuading them from, and that it is not an expression fit for them to use with reference unto any but God and Christ. But because the Doctor doth lay such stress on this Phrase, he may consider whether the Latin Church did use the *Gloria Patri* in Greek in *Tertullians* days?

These are the passages the Doctor thought fit to alledge out of *Tertullian* for what he propounds. The other sort of passages he is concerned with, are such as Mr. *Clarkson* alledged for what he had asserted. There are two of these the Doctor doth take notice of, but saith so little concerning them, I will pass them over without saying any thing of them one way or another; for any one who considers what Mr. *Clarkson* saith with reference to them, and what the Doctor saith of them here, may easily determine whether the passages do make more for the one or for the other. But there is one passage Mr. *Clarkson* doth quote from this Author, about which the Doctor takes a great deal of pains, to shew it is capable of an interpretation which will not serve Mr. *Clarkson's* purpose. I will relate the passage, and without reflecting on the laboured constructions the Doctor hath

hath heaped together, to render it useleſs to Mr. Clarkſons deſign, I will plainly acquaint you with what I conceive to be the ſureſt way to find out *Tertullians* meaning. The paſſage is this; *Manibus expaſis, quia innocuis, capite nudo, quia non erubeſcimus; denique, ſine monitore, quia de pectore oramus.* *Tertullian*, I apprehend, doth here give an account of the Chriſtians Prayers, that they were not ſuch as the Heathens were, but ſuch as did ſuit and agree with the advice and direction the Apoſtle had given concerning this buſineſs. His words ſeem to give an account, of what he underſtood to be the Apoſtles meaning, 1 *Tim.* 2. 8. where he willetth men to Pray every where, liſting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting. But the Doctor thinks the paſſage is obſcure. If ſo, then certainly *Tertullian* is fitteſt to give an account of his own meaning; and I think he doth ſo, in a very few lines after: For having ſhewed why he, and ſo all Chriſtians could not pray to any but God, he ſeems very plainly to explain in other words, the ſeveral branches of the forementioned account concerning the Chriſtians Prayers. — *Ei offero optimam & majorem hoſtiam; quam ipſe mandavit; orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de ſpiritu ſancto proſectam.* This I take to be the true account of this controverted paſſage; whether I am in the right or not concerning it, I leave you to judge, as alſo whether this paſſage ſo underſtood, do make more for or againſt preſcribed Forms of Prayer. Theſe being the paſſages made uſe of from the Authors in the ſecond Century about Liturgies, I proceed to the

Tertul. Apol.

P. 54.

In which the first Author the Doctor doth quote is *Hippolytus*. The passage is this; *Liturgy shall be extinguished, singing of Psalms shall cease, and reading of Scripture shall not be heard.* What *Hippolytus*, his meaning here is, I will not undertake to affirm positively, because I never read that Author. But as seeing the Doctor doth argue from the word *λειτουργία*, I am willing to mind you that the Doctor doth acknowledg it is but probable, that this Father meant a common Form of Prayer generally used. And I do acknowledge it would be more probable that that Father understood the word in the Doctors sense, if he had produced any proof that *λειτουργία* did either before, or in the days of this Father ever signifie a common Form of Prayer generally used in the Christian Church. Indeed I am not aware that any thing more can be warrantably concluded from this expression, than that Antichrist would suppress the publick pure Worship of God. And why Antichrist may not as well suppress the publick exercise of Ministers gifts and abilities in the Worship of God, as the use of prescribed Forms of Prayer, doth not yet occur unto me. But if Antichrist have already made any attempts against the publick Worship of God, I must needs say, I do not remember any evidence he hath given of his extraordinary dislike of Forms of Prayer, meerly as Forms. Nor do I mind any proof that hath been produced that *λειτουργία* did about the Year 220. signifie publick prescribed Forms.

P. 55.

Our next Author (saith the Doctor) is the Famous *Origen*, in whose eleventh Homily on *Jer.* we have

‘so

'so exprefs a Form of Prayer, which was wont to be
 'used in his days, the learned *Centuriators* were con-
 'vinced by it, that set Forms of Prayer were used in
 'his time. The matter in debate is not whether
 those learned men were convinced from that passage,
 that set Forms of Prayer were used in his time; But
 whether that passage is a substantial proof, that the
 Christian Church did in *Origen's* time worship God
 only by a prescribed Liturgy. Now the Argument
 from this Homily to prove a stated Liturgy, depends (as
Mr. Clarkson saith) on the Mode or Form of expreffion
 here used; and what *Origen's* way of expreffing him-
 self in this place was, we have not any certainty, be-
 cause we have not his own words here, but his Tran-
 slator's, who have certified us they did not tie them-
 selves to an exact and strict translation. This argu-
 ment therefore cannot be convincing in the present
 case, because we have no assurance of the truth and
 certainty of that, on which the Argument de-
 pends, and from which it must derive its whole
 strength. The Doctor doth not take notice of this,
 but suggests it is pretended that *Ruffinus* might add this
 Prayer himself. But the doubt is not so much whe-
 ther he added the Prayer, as whether he did not
 alter the Mode of expreffion, and in his Translation
 put that into the Form of a Prayer, which *Origen* pro-
 pounded in another Form? For tho *Origen* might
 only relate, as *St. Paul* doth, *Ephes. i. 16, 17.* what
 was the ordinary subject of their Petitions on such
 occasions, *Ruffinus* might in his Translation deliver
 it in the Form of a Prayer. And till we have
 some assurance that *Origen* is here faithfully transla-
 ted, and did exprefs himself exactly in the same
 Mode the Translator reports this matter, the Ar-
 gument

P. 141.

gument cannot be convincing to the purpose for which it is brought. Mr. *Clarkson* further adds, 'That allow all that can be pretended fairly from this place, no more can be concluded from it, than what is common with those who do pray extempore, viz that they often in Prayer preferred one or two Petitions in the same words. To which the Doctor hath not thought fit to make any reply. If those who do officiate, do frequently use the same words in Prayer concerning the same matter, is the inference thence just, that therefore they may not use any words, or that they are bound up to a prescribed Liturgy in their whole worship? But having said thus much concerning the Dispute betwixt the Doctor and Mr. *Clarkson* touching this passage, I will relate the matter it self more distinctly. *Origen* having taken notice in the fore-mentioned Homily, that the Prophets having suffered many hardships from the People, on the account of the messages they did bring them, and the threatenings they denounced against them from the Lord, it was expedient that those who hear the word should be briefly admonished what manner of lives the Prophets did lead, and what benefits did appertain unto them, and what their own duty is, viz that if they would partake of the happiness the Prophets have arrived at, they must diligently endeavour to do the works they did. And in short, he adds, his meaning is thus; *Frequenter in Oratione dicimus, Da Omnipotens, Da nobis partem cum Prophetis, &c. O Almighty, grant, grant unto us a part with the Prophets, grant us a part with the Apostles of thy Christ, grant that we may be found at the footsteps of thy only begotten.* But (saith he) when we speak these things, we do not understand, or we have not a due sense of what these Petitions do import.

*Orig. Hom. XI.
in Jer.*

port. For in reality, when we speak thus, we do ask that God would make us to be hated as they were hated, &c. Now the matter seems very plain, viz. That *Origen* expounding the Scripture popularly, took occasion to mind the people how careful they should be, if they desired to be happy as the Prophets are, to live such lives as they did, and not content themselves with saying (as was very usual for them when they heard affectionate discourses concerning the Prophets and Apostles, &c.) Lord give us a part with them, &c. For, saith he, these Petitions or Prayers we are so prone to use when our affections are moved at the reports which are made to us concerning the Prophets, do properly signifie what we do not at all think of, or really intend, when we use those expressions. For these Prayers do really signifie our desiring of God, that we may be hated as the Prophets were, and fall into the same calamities they did endure. *Re enim hoc dicimus, fac nos sic odio haberi, ut odio habiti sunt Prophetae; — Da in istas incidere calamitates quas Apostoli sustinuerunt.* Is it any proof that he who administers Divine Ordinances is tied up to a fixed Liturgy, because in his popular discourses on particular occasions, in his pressing people to a good life, he tells them, we do ordinarily pray, O Almighty, grant us this, or that, or the other thing, and that these Petitions are of such importance as to ingage our endeavours to lead such lives as we are persuaded unto? Yea, it may be, if the matter be well inquired into, it will be found that *Origen's* explication of this Prayer, is a more just reproof of the Prayer it self, than his relating it, is a proof of the Administrators being tied up to the use of Forms in his time. For it may be very well questioned, whether Christi-
ans

ans may pray for what he saith those Petitions do properly import.

P. 58.

The next passage the Doctor doth quote out of *Origen*, is in his sixth Book against *Celsus*; And he places the force of this quotation on the Participle [*προσυχόμεναι*] which he finds in it, and of which he gives this account, that 'it signifies not only a thing 'injoined or commanded in general, but so enjoined 'that the very order and manner of doing it, is set 'down and particularly appointed. And I may truly say that all this may be with reference unto Prayers, and yet the very words to be used, not be set down, and particularly appointed, without which there is no Liturgy in our present acception of that word. But, saith the Doctor, '*Origen* is speaking of the 'Prayers themselves, and gives them this Character, 'that they were ordered or prescribed, and therefore 'must be in Forms. To which I answer, that all he saith (except his inference) doth amount to no more than an order for the method of the performance, but doth not reach to the prescribing of the words. And if God have not only commanded us to pray, but hath also given Rules for the manner of performing this Duty, when we perform this Service according to the Rules he hath appointed, we may properly be said to use *ταῖς προσυχόμεναις τοῖς ὡχαῖς*. But if we consider the passage intirely as *Origen* hath it (for the Doctor hath left something out) it will clear it self. We do affirm for a certain truth (saith *Origen*) that they who do worship God, the Lord of all things, through Jesus in the Christian manner or way, and be according to the Gospel, using frequently, as they ought, night and day [*ταῖς προσυχόμεναις τοῖς ὡχαῖς*] such Prayers as are appointed or commanded, are not vanquishable, or cannot be over-

come

*Orig. in Cels.
lib. 6.*

come either by Magicians or Devils. These last words the Doctor thought fit to leave out. Now let any one judge, whether by using appointed Prayers, *Origen* meant offering up to God Prayers in such way as he had appointed, or using such prayers as were composed by Men, and saying them over in such order as they had prescribed; which of these do you imagine *Origen* thought to be the Christian's effectual security from Magicians and Devils? Can it enter into any Mans head, who knows any thing of *Origen*, that he was for Christians to use Prayers, as others did Spells? How came the use of prescribed Forms to be better security from Magicians and Devils, than any other way of praying?

There is further a Dispute betwixt the Doctor and Mr. *Clarkson*, whether *Origen*, quoting some passages which are in the Psalms, did, by saying, we find them *ἐν τῇ εὐχαρίᾳ*, or *ἐν ταῖς εὐχαρίαις*, mean the publick Liturgy, or the Psalter? To which I shall only say, That I do not perceive that there is any Antecedent proof, that they had a publick Liturgy, but it is certain they had the Book of Psalms amongst them. I leave you to determine whether it is most probable that *Origen*, being to quote Passages which were in the Book of Psalms, would rather refer his Reader to another Book, than unto that which was acknowledged to be divinely inspired?

P. 61.

St. Cyprian is next brought by the Doctor as a Witness for Liturgies. And I might suppose, ' That he did allow ' the Lord's Prayer to be used as a Form of Prayer, and ' that he would have us repeat the very words of ' it: And yet this will not amount to any resemblance of a proof for Liturgies, as they are here to be under-

P. 65.

G

stood.

stood. But the Passages in St. Cyprian the Doctor alledgeth, do not (I think) import what he pretends they do. St. Cyprian, in his Sermon concerning the Lord's Prayer, seems to have the very same Notions about it, his Master Tertullian had expressed in his Tract concerning the same matter, of which I have spoken before. There are indeed some Passages in St. Cyprian's Sermon, from which the Doctor doth draw his own inferences. The enquiry must be, whether St. Cyprian's meaning in those passages was what the Doctor pretends?

Cypr. Serm. de
Orat. Dom.

St. Cyprian hath this Passage: *Orandi ipse formam dedit, ipse quid precaremur monuit & instruxit.* I conceive he means no more than this, That the Lord Jesus hath taught People in what manner they should pray, and what things they should pray for. I think if we consider St. Cyprian's Discourse, we cannot warrantably understand any thing else by his *Orandi forma*, than those Instructions our Saviour gave for our Direction in performing of this duty of Prayer. St. Cyprian doth also certify, that the surest way to obtain acceptance and audience with the Father, is to govern our selves in the performance of this Duty by the directions the Son hath given for this purpose: *Ut dum prece & oratione quam filius docuit, apud patrem facilius audiamur.* If we strictly consider this Father's sense and meaning, there doth not appear any ground to conclude that he laid any stress on our using the very words of which the Lord's Prayer doth consist. And besides several passages which might be instanced in, which do strongly intimate that what I have already mentioned, is the substance of this Father's meaning here, there is one short

short Passage, at a little distance from these already mentioned, which, to me, seems to put the matter out of all doubt: *Ut aliter orare quàm docuit, non ignorantia sola sit, sed & culpa.* Now let any man, who knows any thing at all of St. Cyprian, judge whether he thought that it was a sin to use any other words in Prayer, than just those which were expressed in the Lord's Prayer; and whether his meaning was not, that it is a sin or fault to govern our selves in the performing of this duty, by other Instructions, than those the Son had given for our guidance in this Duty? This I take to be the meaning of that other Passage, *Agnoscat pater filii sui verba, cum precem facimus.* By *verba filii sui*, I conceive is not meant the words of the Lord's Prayer, but the Instructions and Directions the Son gave for the right performing of this duty. Here I may mind you, that the Doctor in his Discourse on one of his Quotations out of Origen, hath this Passage: 'Note also Origen doth not say, the Christian made these injoynd Prayers;' but used 'them; which supposes they were made into a prescribed Form before. Now what doth the Doctor think might be noted here (according to his way of making notes) upon *precem facimus*? But for my part I think the Ancients, by making Prayers, and by using Prayers, meant much what the same thing, viz. performing the duty of Prayer. Moreover, St. Cyprian hath this Expression, *Si petamus ipsius oratione*; And this he immediately interprets (I think) by our governing our selves in this Duty by the Directions he had laid down about it. And his account of these Directions is very like that Tertullian had given of them before him: *Sit autem orantibus sermo*

1d.

P. 60.

1d.

& *precatio cum disciplina, quietem continens, & pudorem.* There are two Passages more relating to this matter, which the Doctor quotes out of this Author, in which he considers the words the Author useth, but neglects the sense and meaning the Author had, in his using of those words. The first is this, *Publica est nobis & communis oratio.* Now St. Cyprian's meaning is neither more nor less than this; That Christians must not be so confined and narrow-spirited, in their Prayers, as to pray only for themselves, but they must extend their Prayers to others, and pray for all People. He does not call the Christians Prayer *publick and common*, because he speaks of the Lord's Prayer, as the Doctor pretends, nor as intimating, that there was one fixed prescribed form, which all were to use, but because their prayers were not to be confined to themselves, but to be general or universal extending to all Men. That this is the plain and obvious sense of this place, I appeal to any one, who will consider what goes a little before, and what immediately follows these words, *Ante omnia pacis doctor, atque unitatis magister singulatim noluit & privatim precem fieri, ut quis cum precatur, pro se tantum precetur — publica est nobis, & communis oratio, & quum oramus, non pro uno, sed pro populo toto oramus.* This is also the plain meaning of his next Quotation, as you will easily perceive when you see the sentence entire which is thus; *Unusquisque oret dominum non pro se tantum, sed & pro omnibus fratribus, sicut Dominus Jesus orare nos docuit, ubi non singulis privatam precem mandavit, sed communi & concordæ prece orare pro omnibus jussit.*

Cyp. Ep. ad
Cler. &c.

The

The Doctor saith there are still more evident Proofs in this Author, not only of Forms, but of a Liturgy. And his first Instance is out of the fore-mentioned Sermon concerning the Lord's Prayer. I forbear a great many Reflections I might easily make on what the Doctor saith concerning this Passage; I will only mind you, that a *Common Prayer* in the present sense of that Phrase, must be proved to be in St. Cyprian's time, before it can be owned that he cited *Sursum Corda*, out of that Common Prayer. And notwithstanding this Phrase is to be found in Liturgies framed long after St. Cyprian's time, it doth not appear there was any such Liturgy then; nor does St. Cyprian say a word here of this Phrase being used in the Eucharist, though Liturgies since framed, have inserted it in that Office. Now the whole St. Cyprian saith about this matter amounts but to this; He having exhorted the People to keep their minds and hearts very intent upon what should be their business when they are offering up their Prayers unto God; he explains to them the design of an Exhortation the Priest did usually give them, before he began his prayer. *Ideo & sacerdos* Cyp. de Orat. Dom.
ante orationem præfatione præmissa, parat fratrum mentes dicendo, Sursum corda, ut dum respondet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum, admoneatur nihil aliud se quam Dominum cogitare debere. And from hence he inforces on them his former Instruction or Exhortation. Now if a Minister cannot pray but in a prescribed Form, after that he hath desired the People to lift up their hearts to God, and they have declared their readiness to concur with him therein, this may pass for a proof of prescribed Liturgies. The present business

is not to enquire what inferences others have made from this Passage, but whether a prescribed Liturgy be deduceable from a Ministers desiring the People before he begins to pray, to lift up their hearts to God, and attend to what should be the main business of Prayer, or from their answering that they are ready and willing to concur with him in what he desires of them ?

P. 67.

Here appearing so little evidence for Liturgies in this Passage, I proceed to the Doctor's next more evident proof for a Liturgy out of this Author. 'We may observe (saith the Doctor) not only by this Preface, but also by another Passage that the *African* Church and the *Eastern* did hugely agree in these Liturgick Forms, because, as the *Greeks* say, 'Give holy things to those that are Holy. So it seems they did at *Carthage*, where (as *St. Cyprian* notes) they were daily charged to keep that which was Holy in a pure Conscience, according to our Lord's Command, not to cast that which is Holy to Dogs, that is, in the Eucharist (which they then daily celebrated) they used that Phrase, Give Holy things to Holy Persons. Now the truth, with reference to this passage, is this; *St. Cyprian*, in the beginning of his Discourse against *Demetrian*, acquaints him why he had so long chosen rather to keep silence, than to make a formal answer to his Calumnies and Railery; And for his warrant in doing thus, he quotes some places of Scripture, and immediately inserts these words; *Et Sanctum quoque jubeamur intra conscientiam nostram tenere, nec conculcandum porcis & canibus exponere*: For the proof of which command or charge, he refers, not to their Communion Service, or their Office

Cyp. ad Demet.

Office at the Eucharist, (as the Doctor hints) but to a Passage of our Saviour's, as it is laid down expressly in the Gospel: *Loquente Domino, & dicente, ne dederitis sanctum canibus, neque miseritis margaritas vestras ante porcos, &c.* In this same Tract the Doctor pretends to find a Christian Litany; he refers to the same page he had quoted for the former Passage, but you will find the Passage he speaks of, towards the latter end of this Tract. Here St. Cyprian saith, That notwithstanding Christians can rejoyce in every Condition, and patiently bear the most adverse occurrences, because of the respect they have unto the happy and blessed Estate which is to come; yet they do as occasion requires offer up their Prayers to God for temporal blessings, and the removing or moderating of Adversities, &c.

P. 68.

Et tamen pro arcendis hostibus, & imbris impetrandis, & vel auferendis vel temperandis adversis rogamus semper, & preces fundimus, &c. Now because St. Cyprian and Tertullian do give an account of some things which were the subject matter of the Christians constant or occasional Petitions, (for I suppose the Doctor doth hardly think the Christians did every day pray for the procuring of Rain) therefore the Doctor concludes they had a Liturgy; And because the particulars mentioned, were prayed for in the Ancient Litanies, (though much younger than either of these two Authors) therefore in the times of these Authors, they had a certain Form, though they concealed the phrases of it from unbelievers. If any Man can see any strength in this way of arguing, before it be proved that these things cannot be

Cyp. Cont.
Demet.

be prayed for but in prescribed words, I must acknowledge he can see farther than I can.

P. 69.

The Doctor having produced these Testimonies from *St. Cyprian*, to evidence a Liturgy in his days, applies himself to answer some Passages *Mr. Clarkson* had offered from this Author, to prove that in his days, those who did officiate were at liberty to express themselves in their Prayers as they thought most convenient. The first Quotation for this purpose is out of *St. Cyprian's* Epistle to Pope *Lucius*, where he gives him an account of their praying to God for him suitably to the present occasion which was offered them. This occasion of offering up their prayers for him was particular, and such as was not incident every day. The Question now is this, Whether seeing they did pray for him with a particular regard to what is related in that Epistle, the Petitions they offered up were prescribed, or whether they were expressed freely according as the occasion required? I shall leave the indifferent Reader, when he peruseth what the Doctor hath said about this matter, to conclude as he shall see fit, whether the Doctor hath cleared this Passage to his satisfaction. For I think the Question is not, whether those words he relates there, were the very words they constantly used on that occasion; but whether there was a Prayer ready prescribed for that occasion? If there were not, and they did ordinarily pray for the things mentioned without being confined to use the same words every time, do you judge whether this Passage do make more for the Doctor or *Mr. Clarkson*. It is in my judgment, but a poor answer for the Doctor to insinuate,

insinuate, that a Primate may occasionally pray without a prescribed Form, but inferiour Priests may not, unless Ministerial abilities are not to be exercised proportionably to the measure in which God hath conferred the same, but accordingly as those who have them can climb up towards the top of Ecclesiastical Dignity and Preferment.

His second Allegation (saith the Doctor) out of St. *Cyprian* for such occasional Prayers is, that there are also mention of such occasional Prayers in the Epistle to *Moses* and *Maximus*; but he durst not (saith the Doctor) cite the place at large, which only speaks of private Prayers made by these Confessors in prison, &c. Now because the Doctor hath such a mind to have the place cited at large, I will do it, and then leave you to judge whether it only speaks of private Prayers, or whether the Passage do speak at all of the Prayers of these Confessors? Mr. *Clarkson* refers to the particular Epistle, and the words are these, *Et nos quidem vestri, diebus ac noctibus, memores, & quando in sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus, & cum in secessu privatis precibus oramus, coronis ac laudibus vestris plenam domini faventiam postulamus.*

P. 71.

Cypr.
ad Mos.
Maxim.

Cypr. epist.
ad Mos. &
Maxim.

There is one instance more, the Doctor takes notice of, and seems to be in some passion with Mr. *Clarkson* about it. Now the matter stands thus; Mr. *Clarkson* in one part of his Book is shewing that the Ancients were not so wedded to particular words and phrases, as some have been in latter years. And to give some proof of this, he

H

doth

doth shew amongst other instances, that they did not conceive Christ had so tied them up in the Administration of Baptism, that they must necessarily use just those very words he had set down relating to this matter in the Gospel; but that they had leave to vary their expressions, and change those words related in the Gospel for others, provided they did not change the sense. He shews they did ordinarily vary in several particulars, and amongst the rest he saith some thought themselves not obliged to Baptise expressly, in the name of the Sacred Trinity, so as to name every person, as they are mentioned *Mat. 28. 19.* but in the name of Christ, or of the Lord Jesus, or of the Lord. He farther adds, and this supposed to be the practice of the best times, hath great Advocates. He names several, who are, and were far enough from being lookt upon as Hereticks. Afterwards he quotes this very Passage in *St. Cyprian*, which creates the Doctor so much disturbance. The Doctor seems to be displeased because *Mr. Clarkson* did not quote the Passage entire, without leaving out any words; and then tells us *St. Cyprians* words are these: 'How
'then do some say, who are cut of the Church,
'yea against the Church, that if a Pagan be any
'where, or any way Baptised in the name of
'Christ Jesus, he may obtain the Remission of
Sins? And hereupon the Doctor falls into a warm sort of short talk about Hereticks and Schismaicks. Now *St. Cyprians* words are these;
*Quomodo ergo quidam dicunt, foris extra ecclesiam,
modo in nomine Jesu Christi ubicunq; & quemodocunq;*
gen.

*Cypr. ad.
Juba.*

gentilem Baptizatum Remissionem peccatorum consequi posse? I will not dispute whether the Doctor hath translated this Passage as it ought to be translated, though I do not know any necessity that there is, that *foris extra ecclesiam*, must be used as explanatory of *quidam*. But all that Mr. *Clarkson* brought this Passage for, was to prove that some in St. *Cyprian's* days were of the above mentioned opinion. And I think the quotation is full to that point. He did not produce this place to prove they were Orthodox in St. *Cyprian's* Judgement, but he doth expressly declare St. *Cyprian* did not allow it; yet I am not sensible that it doth follow they were either Hereticks or Schismaticks, because *foris extra ecclesiam*, is in this sentence.

The Doctors next proof for Liturgies is from the account St. *Basil* gives concerning *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, 'who was, so much for a Liturgy that we have the testimony of St. *Basil* (saith the Doctor) concerning him, that he appointed a Form of Prayer for that Church of *Neocesarea*, from which they would not vary in one Ceremony, or in a Word; nor would they add one mystical Form to those which he had left them. Now the Case was thus. St. *Basil* was proving the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, from the Ancients Ascribing Glory and Power to the Father, and the Son, with the Holy Spirit. And having named several of the Ancients who had taught that Glory and Power were to be Ascribed to the Spirit, as well as to the Father, and the Son, he at last mentions *Gregory* the Great, and proves that he was of the

P. 72.

*Basil. de Spir.
sancto. cap. 29.*

P. 73.

same mind, from the present practice of that Church. And to make it appear they had not varied from the Doctrine of that great man, he reports the profound respect the people of that Country still had for him. So that [*i. e.* *Gregory*, *Gr.* as the Doctor relates in his Margin] they would not add any Practice, any Word, or any mystical Form in the Church to what he had left with them. By which I conceive he means, that they did strictly observe that way and method for their ordinary Worship, and kept strictly to those Doctrines, and that way of Administering the Sacrament which were in use in *Gregory's* time. But he doth not say one word of *Gregory's* appointing a Form of Prayer for that Church. Nor does it follow that because they Worshiped God in the same manner, a great many years after *Gregory*, wherein they worshipped him in his time, that therefore they used the very words he used. Whereas, it is said they did not add a word to what he left with them, that doth not relate to their Prayers, but to the Doctrine he taught; for here *St. Basil* is speaking of the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, and proving that Doctrine. And in other places *St. Basil* takes notice how tenacious they were of the Words in which *Gregory* did deliver the Doctrines of Christianity unto them, particularly to prove his own Doctrine to be the same with what *Gregory* did teach, he alledged his having learned from *Macrina* the Doctrines of Faith in the very words wherein *Gregory* had delivered them. If it shall be said he is here proving the Divinity of the Holy

Epist. 73.

Holy Spirit by a part of their Worship, viz. their ascribing Glory and Power to God, what can be inferred from thence is but this; That *Gregory* had taught them when they did ascribe Glory and Power to the Father and Son, to add also, *With the Holy Spirit.* *St. Basil* farther adds, They were so tenacious of what *Gregory* had taught and practised amongst them, they would not depart from that simplicity in the Celebrating of the Worship of God, which he observed, though a more Pompous and Ceremonious way did prevail in other Churches, and which some thought did better suit with the alteration of their circumstances. But here you may take notice that *St. Basil* doth not alledge any Liturgy, *Gregory* had composed for them, but only pleads the present usage of that Church, and argues it was the same in *Gregories* days, not because they had a Liturgy of his Composing, but because their respect to him all along to the present time was such, they would not suffer any addition to be made, to the method or order he observed, or to the Doctrines he had taught. To me it appears plain, that there was not any Liturgy of *Gregories* Composing, *St. Basil* could produce for his present purpose; but finding something in the use of that Church which was pertinent to his business, he alledges that, and the better to inforce that allegation, he urges the great probability there was that they received it from him; and to put the more colour upon this, he breaks forth into a Rhetorical *Encomium* on that Father, and the great respect the people of that Coun-

Country had for him. So that the sentence the Doctor quotes, only entertains us with an Hyperbolical account of the respect the people had for Gregory. For St. Basil himself doth speak much otherwise of this matter when it comes in his way upon a different occasion. And particularly in that very Epistle the Doctor refers us to, in the next place, for a proof 'that this Gregory had appointed that Church a particular way of singing the Psalms, of which the *Næocæsarean* Clergy were so extremely tenacious, that when St. Basil would have brought in a better way, they opposed him in it, and objected that it was not so in the days of Gregory the Great. 'Tis true, it was objected against that way of singing St. Basil would have introduced, that it was not in use there, in the time of Gregory, But if you consider the Answer St. Basil makes to this Objection, you will find him giving an account of the *Næocæsareans* very different from that we have in his Book *de Spiritu Sancto*. Amongst other things which he saith, he peremptorily enquires By what Testimonies will they make it evident, that those things which he recommends to them, were not in use in the time of Gregory? Now assuredly this was a very strange sort of question, if he knew they had a Liturgy of Gregory's Composing, which they constantly made use of. Or if they had but an Order of his framing, which they were strictly to observe in the several parts of their Worship. Yea, he tells them to whom he Writes, that they had not preserved any of those instances then used pure and uncorrupt unto that time.

P. 73.

Basil Epist.
63. ad Cler.
Næocæs.

-11100

More-

moreover he very plainly intimates, that there was no way to make a true judgment of what Gregory did, but by consulting the Holy Scriptures. When he mentions several particulars, which he affirms concerning Gregory, he doth not quote his Liturgy, his Rubrick, &c. but express words of Scripture: particularly he saith, That Gregory Prayed with his Head ~~uncovered~~. Now how doth he prove this? Not from any order Gregory had made concerning this matter, but because the Apostle had said, *Every man Praying or Prophecying, with his Head covered, dishonoureth his Head*; And Gregory (saith he) was a genuine Disciple of the Apostles. Thus you have an account of those two Passages the Doctor doth quote out of St. Basil. And you may now judge whether it be possible to have a clearer proof in the World for Prescribed Forms than this; And whether the Doctor had any occasion given him from these Allegations, to break forth into such a Vaunting Discourse as he entertains his Reader with, upon his having produced these quotations?

As for what the Doctor quotes out of Eusebius concerning Paulus Samosatenus; It only concerns Hymns; and I am not sensible that the way of arguing is cogent, That because people do sing Hymns composed to their hands, therefore they do or must necessarily pray by prescribed Forms. One might think the Precentor of York should understand the difference there is, betwixt praying, and singing, if any knowledge of the nature, and use of singing, of framing the voice into a regular, melodious, tunable sound, in order to the raising

raising of the affections, be at all necessary to that Character. And a due consideration of that, might have prevented a great many tautologies which are to be found in his Scholastical History, and would have made his Discourse much shorter than it is, though it must have deprived the Reader of many of those flights (which it may be) the Doctor conceits are very graceful. But if you have a mind to peruse the Passage (the Doctor speaks of) in *Eusebius*, if you consult *Valesius* his Edition, you must not look for it where the Doctor's Margin directs, but in *lib. 7. cap. 30.*

P. 76.

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 35. p. 180.

'I shall add no more (saith the Doctor) in this Century, but to observe, that in the Epistle of *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, recorded by *Eusebius*, it appears to have been the general usage of the Church, for every one of the People to say *Amen*, when they heard the Priest offer them the Sacrament, and say, The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c. which was a Form so universally used in all Churches of the world, that we may conclude it was enjoined by all Liturgies. What Edition of *Eusebius* the Doctor made use of, I do not know. But his Margin gives me no assistance for the finding of the place he speaks of. The *Form*, the Doctor saith, was so universally used, I suppose is these words, *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.* Now I do not remember that *Eusebius* doth any where in his Sixth Book report, either from *Dionysius*, or any other, that those words were universally used on the occasion the Doctor mentions. But there is a Passage

a passage in his Sixth Book which hath something of what the Doctor mentions; whether that be the place the Doctor means, I know not. I will give you the English of it, and refer you to the Author, to see whether you can find any thing there for the Doctor's purpose. *Eusebius* saith that *Cornelius* relates to *Fabius* the worst of all the wickednesses which *Novatus* was guilty of, which was this. *When he hath consecrated the Elements, dividing unto every one a Portion, and giving it unto him, he compels those wretched persons to swear instead of giving thanks, for catching the hands of him who receiveth, within both his hands, he doth not loose them till he hath sworn in this manner (for I will report his words) Swear to me by the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou wilt never forsake me, and turn to Cornelius. And the miserable man doth not taste of the Elements, till he hath first pronounced a Curse upon himself; and when he receives that Bread, instead of saying, Amen, He saith I will not return to Cornelius.* If this be the passage the Doctor means, here is nothing said of the peoples hearing the Priest say these particular words, *The Body of our Lord Jesus, &c.* Besides, this passage is not in *Dionysius* his Epistle, but in *Cornelius* his Epistle to *Fabius*. But yet there is in *Eusebius's* Seventh Book an Epistle of *Dionysius*, which hath something in it that hath some resemblance to some part of that the Doctor relates; I will give you an account of that, and then I have done with the Doctors quotations for this Century. *Dionysius* in his Epistle

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 43. p. 245.

*Euseb. Hist. Ec-
cles. lib. 7. cap.
9. p. 255.*

file to *Xystus*, Bishop of *Rome*; relates how one who had been esteemed, or reckoned a great while for one of the Faithful, upon his observing how Baptism was celebrated amongst the Orthodox, was in very great trouble, because having been Baptised amongst the Hereticks, his Baptism was not the same, nor had not any thing common with the Baptism of the Orthodox; And therefore he was very desirous to be Baptised again. *Dionysius* durst not do it, but told him, that his long continued Communion with the Church was sufficient. *For I may not Baptise him again, who hath often heard the Praises which are offered unto God, and hath answered with the rest, Amen; who hath stood at the Table, and hath stretched forth his hands to take the Sacred Food, and hath received the same, and hath for a convenient time been partaker of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.* If this be the passage the Doctor means, you will easily perceive, that he gives not a fair account of it, and that it is not at all for his purpose. I do not see how a prescribed Liturgy can be inferred from either of these passages related out of *Eusebius*, no nor (supposing good evidence that the Priest did constantly use these words, *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c.* in distributing and giving the Bread unto the people) how we can justly conclude there was a prescribed Liturgy, from the words of which, the Priest must never vary in any of his Prayers and Praises in Publick?

Sir,

Sir, I think I have now given you a true account of all those passages the Doctor hath produced out of the Ancients, for Liturgies, in the three First *Centuries*. It is easie for any man, who lays aside prejudice, and will form a judgment of matters only in proportion to the evidence which is offered for them, to determine whether His Quotations be a solid proof of that for which he produceth them.

I have confined my self to what the Doctor alledgeth for Liturgies in the three First *Centuries*, because I think this pretended Antiquity of Liturgies is designed, not to justify their *lawfulness* (and would we content our selves with that, and effectually prove their expediency, the breach betwixt us, and the greatest part of our Fellow-Protestants relating to this matter, would soon be made up) but to introduce, or support an Opinion of their *Necessity* in the *Christian Church*. And I conceive the three First *Centuries*, is a period of sufficient extent for an enquiry, concerning a matter so circumstanced. The *lawfulness* of Liturgies may be argued from more Rational Topicks, than Humane Authority. Their *Expediency* must be judged of, upon a just weighing of circumstances; Their *Necessity* cannot be proved by any Topick.

Those who attempt to advance the *Necessity* of Liturgies, do not only oppose them, who were wont to be called Dissenters, but are apparently managing a Design against the most Learned, Judicious, and Moderate, who are in the Communion of the *Church of England*: And therefore

fore it may be proper enough, for one of the Church of *England* to mind such Persons, That to catch up some words and Phrases, which are to be found in the Writings of the Ancient Fathers in the Christian Church, leaving their sense behind, and then tacking them together in Discourses about Liturgies, will no more prove Liturgies to be as Ancient as they pretend, than the Artificial Fastning of a *Long Gray-Beard* to a Youth's *Chin*, will prove him to be a very Old Man.

Sir, With reference to the following Part of the Doctor's Book, I shall only tell you at present, That I take it to be of a *Piece* with that Part I have already considered. And if you are desirous to have a more distinct account of the Greatest Part of his more Numerous Quotations in the *Fourth Century*, you need not give your self any further trouble, than to signify your pleasure to

Your Most Affectionate Friend,

and Faithful Servant, &c.

THE END.

